

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

TYRONE BLOCKER,

Plaintiff,

v.

**UNIVERSAL MUSIC PUBLISHING
GROUP,**

Defendant.

Case No. 3:14-cv-01650-HU

ORDER

Michael H. Simon, District Judge.

United States Magistrate Judge Dennis J. Hubel issued Findings and Recommendation in this case on December 1, 2014. Dkt. 4. Judge Hubel recommended that Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. 1) be granted solely for the purpose of screening Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (Dkt. 3) and that Plaintiff's Amended Complaint be dismissed with 30 days leave to replead. No party has filed objections.

Under the Federal Magistrates Act ("Act"), the court may "accept, reject or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). If a party files objections to a magistrate's findings and recommendation, "the court shall make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made." *Id.*; Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(3).

If no party objects, the Act does not prescribe any standard of review. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 152 (1985) ("There is no indication that Congress, in enacting [the Act], intended to require a district judge to review a magistrate's report[.]"); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328

F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (*en banc*) (the court must review de novo magistrate's findings and recommendation if objection is made, "but not otherwise").

Although review is not required in the absence of objections, the Act "does not preclude further review by the district judge[] *sua sponte* . . . under a *de novo* or any other standard."

Thomas, 474 U.S. at 154. Indeed, the Advisory Committee Notes to Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) recommend that "[w]hen no timely objection is filed," the court review the magistrate's findings and recommendation for "clear error on the face of the record."

No party having made objections, this Court follows the recommendation of the Advisory Committee and reviews Judge Hubel's Findings and Recommendation for clear error on the face of the record. No such error is apparent. Accordingly, the Court ADOPTS Judge Hubel's Findings and Recommendation. Dkt. 4. Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (Dkt. 1) is GRANTED. Plaintiff's Amended Complaint (Dkt. 3) is DISMISSED. Plaintiff may file an amended complaint within 30 days of the date of this Order if he can cure the deficiencies identified in Judge Hubel's Findings and Recommendation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 5th day of January, 2015.

/s/ Michael H. Simon
Michael H. Simon
United States District Judge